

University of Groningen

Inhibitory selectivity among class I HDACs has a major impact on inflammatory gene expression in macrophages

Cao, Fangyuan; Zwinderman, Martijn; van Merkerk, Ronald; Ettema, Petra; Quax, Wim; Dekker, Frank J.

Published in:
European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry

DOI:
[10.1016/j.ejmech.2019.05.038](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmech.2019.05.038)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Final author's version (accepted by publisher, after peer review)

Publication date:
2019

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Cao, F., Zwinderman, M., van Merkerk, R., Ettema, P., Quax, W., & Dekker, F. J. (2019). Inhibitory selectivity among class I HDACs has a major impact on inflammatory gene expression in macrophages. *European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry*, 177, 457-466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmech.2019.05.038>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Take-down policy


If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Accepted Manuscript

Inhibitory selectivity among class I HDACs has a major impact on inflammatory gene expression in macrophages

Fangyuan Cao, Martijn Zwinderman, Ronald van Merkerk, Petra Ettema, Wim Quax, Frank J. Dekker



PII: S0223-5234(19)30448-9

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmech.2019.05.038>

Reference: EJMECH 11348

To appear in: *European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry*


Received Date: 10 April 2019

Revised Date: 10 May 2019

Accepted Date: 13 May 2019

Please cite this article as: F. Cao, M. Zwinderman, R. van Merkerk, P. Ettema, W. Quax, F.J. Dekker, Inhibitory selectivity among class I HDACs has a major impact on inflammatory gene expression in macrophages, *European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry* (2019), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmech.2019.05.038>.

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



Inhibitory selectivity among class I HDACs has a major impact on inflammatory gene expression in macrophages

Fangyuan Cao, Martijn Zwinderman, Ronald van Merkerk, Petra Ettema, Wim Quax, Frank J. Dekker*

Chemical and Pharmaceutical Biology, Groningen Research Institute of Pharmacy (GRIP), University of Groningen, Groningen 9713 AV, The Netherlands.

Abstract: Histone deacetylases (HDACs) play an important role in cancer, degenerative diseases and inflammation. The currently applied HDAC inhibitors in the clinic lack selectivity among HDAC isoforms, which limits their application for novel indications such as inflammatory diseases. Recent literature indicates that HDAC 3 plays an important role among class I HDACs in gene expression in inflammation. In this perspective, the development and understanding of inhibitory selectivity among HDACs 1, 2 and 3 and their respective influence on gene expression need to be characterized to facilitate drug discovery. Towards this aim, we synthesized nine structural analogs of the class I HDAC inhibitor Entinostat and investigated their selectivity profile among HDACs 1, 2 and 3. We found that we can explain the observed structure activity relationships by small structural and conformational differences between HDAC 1 and HDAC 3 in the 'lid' interacting region. Cell-based studies indicated, however, that application of inhibitors with improved HDAC 3 selectivity did not provide an anti-inflammatory response in contrast to expectations from biochemical evidence in literature. Altogether, in this study, we identified structure activity relationships among class I HDACs and we connected isoform selectivity among class I HDACs with pro- and anti-inflammatory gene transcription in macrophages.

Keywords Histone deacetylases inhibitors (HDACi), Entinostat, NF- κ B activity, inflammation.

1. Introduction

Histone deacetylases (HDACs) play an important role in cancer, degenerative diseases and inflammation. Currently, HDAC inhibitors are in clinical use for the treatment of cancer. However, they often lack selectivity among HDAC isoforms, which limits their application for novel indications such as inflammatory diseases. Recent literature indicates that HDAC 3 plays an important role among class I HDACs in gene expression in inflammation (as

reviewed [1]). In this perspective, the development and understanding of inhibitory selectivity among HDACs 1, 2 and 3 and their respective influence on gene expression need to be characterized to facilitate drug discovery.

HDACs are a family of enzymes that deacetylate lysine residues of histones and non-histone proteins. Deacetylation of lysine residues in histones leads to a more condensed chromatin structure and makes DNA less accessible for gene transcription [2]. To date, eighteen HDAC isoenzymes have been identified, and they are divided into four classes based on their structural similarity [3,4]. Class I HDACs, which include zinc-dependent HDAC 1, 2, 3 and 8, are well-known for their importance in gene expression, survival, and proliferation in cells [5]. Therefore, small molecule inhibitors of class I HDACs have been considered as potential therapeutics in cancer [6], neurological disorders [7], inflammatory diseases [8] and also cardiac and pulmonary diseases [4]. Most of the currently available HDAC inhibitors share the same structural characteristics i.e. they contain: 1) a zinc-binding group (ZBG) to bind the zinc ion of the active site of class I HDACs, 2) a linker part that mimics the lysine side chain and 3) a cap group that binds to the edge of active site. In our study, we selected Entinostat as a class I selective HDAC inhibitor to explore structure activity relationships for selectivity among class I HDAC isoforms and its respective influence on pro- and anti-inflammatory gene expression in macrophages.




Figure 1. Chemical structures of HDAC inhibitors with an *o*-aminoanilide core structure Entinostat, Mocetinostat and Chidamide. The general design of HDAC inhibitors with a zinc binding group (blue), a linker (pink) and a cap (red) is shown.

It has been shown that HDACs are important regulators in immune responses [9,10]. Therefore, development of HDAC inhibitors as new immunomodulatory therapeutics holds promise for development of therapeutics in inflammation [11] and cancer [12,13].

Interestingly, there are currently several clinical trials ongoing that aim to evaluate the synergy for combination of HDAC inhibitors and immune therapies in cancer [12,13]. Increasing evidence indicates that HDAC inhibitors play key roles in regulation of the immune cells in their respective microenvironment in immune reactions [13,14]. Key players in the immune microenvironment are macrophages, which can secrete both pro-inflammatory cytokines such as Tumor Necrosis Factor- α (TNF- α) and anti-inflammatory cytokines such as Interleukin-10 (IL-10) [15,16].

In the context of airway inflammation, our previous works demonstrates that the class I HDAC inhibitor Entinostat has anti-inflammatory effects upon cigarette smoke exposure *in vivo* in a mouse model. The anti-inflammatory effect observed in mice could mechanistically be explained by *in vitro* studies in Lipopolysaccharides (LPS) / Interferon γ (INF γ) - stimulated murine RAW 264.7 macrophages. Upon Entinostat treatment increased acetylation of the nuclear factor- κ B (NF- κ B) transcription factor, increased nuclear localization and increased binding to the IL-10 promotor region. This provides a mechanistic explanation of the observed upregulation of IL-10 expression, which is an anti-inflammatory cytokine [8]. Nevertheless, in the murine macrophage model we found upregulation of the expression of both pro- and anti-inflammatory genes [8], which indicates a mixed effect *in vitro*. The observed effects on the expression of both pro- and anti-inflammatory genes by the class I HDAC inhibitor Entinostat call for further investigation of the role of HDAC inhibitor selectivity in the regulation of pro- and anti-inflammatory gene expression.


Here, we synthesized several analogues of Entinostat and investigated the selectivity profile of these analogues among class I HDACs 1, 2 and 3 and their effects on pro- and anti-inflammatory gene expression. Structure activity relationship (SAR) for small structural variations in the area between the linker and the lid region of the inhibitor were investigated. Subsequently, the influence of HDAC inhibitor selectivity on inflammatory gene expression was assessed using LPS/INF γ -stimulated murine macrophages.

2. Results and discussion

2.1 Synthesis


The synthetic routes to obtain the desired compounds are outlined in Scheme 1, 2 and 3. The *o*-aminoanilide derivatives **4a**, **4b** and **4d** were prepared in two steps (Scheme 1). A reductive amination reaction was used to obtain **3a**, **3b** and **3d** with yields between 45%-75%. Amide **3c** was prepared from 4-(methoxycarbonyl)benzoic acid and aniline by a condensation

reaction using EDCI and HOBt as reagents in a yield of 81%, followed by hydrolysis of the ester using lithium hydroxide to obtain compound **4c** in a yield of 54%. Compounds **4a-d** were obtained by a condensation reaction from **3a-d** with *o*-phenylenediamine using EDCI and HOBt as reagents in a yield of 30%-61%.




Scheme 1. Reagents and conditions: a) EDCI, HOBt, CH₂Cl₂, Et₃N, r.t. overnight; b) LiOH, CH₂Cl₂, r.t., 3 h; c) 50 °C, 6 h; NaBH₃CN, methanol, r.t., overnight; d) *o*-phenylenediamine, EDCI, HOBt, DCM, Et₃N, r.t. overnight.

The pure enantiomers of **4b** were prepared in four steps starting from commercially available (R)-(+)- or (S)-(-)-1-(4-bromophenyl)ethylamine and iodobenzene (Scheme 2). The first step was done by an Ullmann reaction to couple 1-(4-bromophenyl)ethylamine and iodobenzene using L-proline and CuI to give **7a** and **7b** with yields around 33%. Compounds **7a** and **7b** were subjected to cyanation using zinc cyanide with tetrakis(triphenylphosphine)palladium(0) as catalyst to obtain **8a** and **8b** with a yield of about 57%. The cyanides **8a** and **8b** were hydrolyzed and coupled with *o*-phenylenediamine to obtain desired compounds **10a** and **10b** in a yield of around 30%.



Scheme 2. Reagent and conditions: a) K_2CO_3 , L-Proline, CuI, DMSO, 80 °C, overnight; b) $Zn(CN)_2$, $Pd(PPh_3)_4$, DMF, 105 °C, overnight; c) 12 N HCL, 100 °C, overnight; d) EDCI, HOBt, CH_2Cl_2 , r.t., overnight.

Compounds **15a-c** were obtained in two or three steps (Scheme 3). Compound **12a** was produced by using an Ullmann reaction in which 6-aminohexanoic acid and phenyliodide were coupled using deanol and CuI in alkaline conditions [17]. Carboxylates **12a-c** were coupled with *N*-Boc-1,2-phenylenediamine to give the Boc protected **14a-c** with low to moderate yields (6-66%). Boc deprotection was achieved by trifluoroacetic acid treatment to obtain the final product **15a-c**.










Scheme 3. Reagents and conditions: a) CuI, K_2CO_3 , deanol, H_2O , 85 °C, overnight; b) EDCI, HOBt, CH_2Cl_2 , r.t. overnight; c) TFA, CH_2Cl_2 , r.t. 2h.

2.2 HDAC inhibition

The resulting collection of HDAC inhibitors was tested for HDAC inhibition using procedures to assay HDAC activity as described previously by us [18] and others. The IC_{50} values of HDAC inhibitors for HDAC 1, 2 and 3 are listed in Table 1, 2 and 3. In line with prior reports, Entinostat provided IC_{50} 's in the nM range [8,19]. The structure activity relationships show that replacement of the 'lid' region of Entinostat by a phenyl, as present in **4a**, results in a loss of potency for HDAC 1 and 2, whereas the HDAC 3 inhibition remains similar. Using the compound collection **4a**, **4b**, **4c** and **4d**, we probed the selectivity profile among HDACs 1, 2 and 3 (Table 1) by variation of the benzylic position between the 'linker' and the 'lid' region. We observed that introduction of a methyl or a carbonyl in the benzylic position provides inhibitors **4b** and **4c** with respectively 10- or 20-fold reduced inhibitory potency for HDAC 3 compared to much smaller changes for HDAC 1 and 2. Introduction of a methyl on the benzylamine nitrogen in **4d** provides much smaller changes in affinity. The two enantiomers of **4b** are also tested for HDAC 1, 2 and 3 inhibition. The IC_{50} values show that

S-(-)-enantiomer **10a** and R-(+)-enantiomer **10b** are displaying the same selective profile among HDACs 1, 2 and 3, but R-(+)-enantiomer **10b** shows 2 times better inhibitory potency.



Table 1. IC₅₀ values of Entinostat and **4a-d** for HDAC 1, HDAC 2 and HDAC 3. Data are presented as mean values (in μM) \pm SD.



| Name | Structure | HDAC 1 | HDAC 2 | HDAC 3 |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Entinostat ^a |  | 0.19 \pm 0.04 | 0.41 \pm 0.09 | 0.95 \pm 0.19 |
| 4a |  | 1.0 \pm 0.1 | 1.4 \pm 0.05 | 0.6 \pm 0.05 |
| 4b |  | 2,3 \pm 0.2 | 7.0 \pm 0.5 | 8,5 \pm 0.5 |
| 10a |  | 2.4 \pm 0.6 | 8.3 \pm 0.8 | 11 \pm 0.7 |
| 10b |  | 1.3 \pm 0.1 | 4,2 \pm 0.6 | 5.0 \pm 0.1 |
| 4c |  | 3.0 \pm 0.4 | 5.4 \pm 0.3 | 16 \pm 2.2 |
| 4d |  | 1.0 \pm 0.03 | 0.5 \pm 0.01 | 2.8 \pm 0.06 |

^aIC₅₀ values for Entinostat are taken from Leus *et al.*, 2017.

Based on prior literature [20], we set out to explore a series of compounds **15a-c** with HDAC 3 inhibitory selectivity (Table 2). Compound **15a** shows the highest potency for HDAC 3, whereas **15b** has equal IC₅₀'s for HDAC 1 and 3. Compound **15c** has the clearest selectivity profile with the highest potency for HDAC 3 in the same range as RGFP966.

Table 2. IC₅₀ values of RGFP966 and compound **15a-c** for HDAC 1, 2 and 3. Data are presented as mean values. (in μM) \pm SD.

| Name | Structure | HDAC 1 | HDAC 2 | HDAC 3 |
|----------------------|---|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| RGFP966 ^a |  | 5.6 \pm 1.3 | 9.7 \pm 1.8 | 0.21 \pm 0.06 |
| 15a |  | 1.2 \pm 0.2 | 1.3 \pm 0.3 | 0.4 \pm 0.05 |

| | | | | |
|------------|---|---------|---------|----------|
| 15b |  | 1.9±0.1 | 3.7±0.7 | 1.2±0.1 |
| 15c |  | 4.2±0.8 | 8.1±1.5 | 0.6±0.07 |

^a IC₅₀ values for RGFP966 are taken from Leus *et al.*, 2016.

2.3 Docking studies

A molecular modelling study was performed to connect the observed SAR among class I HDACs 1, 2 and 3 to structural information. Towards this aim a selection of the inhibitors was docked into the active sites of HDACs by the program Discovery studio (Dassault systèmes) version 2018, using the crystal structures of human HDAC 1 (PDB-code: 5ICN), human HDAC 2 (PDB-code: 4LY1) and human HDAC 3 (PDB-code: 4A69). The CDOCKER protocol was employed for docking by a CHARMM based algorithm. This docking protocol was verified by redocking of the ligand (4-(acetylamino)-N-[2-amino-5-(thiophen-2-yl)phenyl]benzamide) from the HDAC 2 crystal structure [21]. The ligand was removed from the HDAC 2 crystal structure, and then, was docked back using the CDOCKER protocol. This provides positions comparable to the original binding pose in all top 10 lowest CDOCKER energies poses [21], thus confirming that the docking protocol can recapitulate the binding pose in the crystal structure of HDAC 2. Next, we verified the docking protocol for HDAC 1 and 3. We made an overlay of HDAC 1, 2 and 3 on the α -carbon atoms of the protein backbone and copied the ligand (4-(acetylamino)-N-[2-amino-5-(thiophen-2-yl)phenyl]benzamide) from the HDAC 2 crystal structure 4YL1 into the active sites of HDAC 1 and 3. Subsequently, the *o*-aminoanilide core was used as a reference to evaluate the docking of the inhibitors into the HDAC 1 and 3 active sites. We found that the docking protocol enables positioning of *o*-aminoanilide core of the novel inhibitors in HDAC 1 and 3 active site with poses that are very similar to the pose of *o*-aminoanilide core of the reference inhibitor in HDAC 2. The top 10 CDOCKER energies poses were visually inspected and poses in which the *o*-aminoanilide core docked outside the active site were discarded. For all the ligands a high convergence in the position of *o*-aminoanilide core was observed in the 10 highest ranked poses (examples are shown in Figure S1 and S2). Poses with the lowest CDOCKER energies are shown as representative poses in all figures.

Firstly, we performed a docking analysis to find an explanation for the 20-fold difference in HDAC 3 inhibitory potency between **4a** and **4c** (Figure 2A). The amine and carbonyl of *o*-aminoanilide group in both the reference ligand and tested compounds are embedded in the

active site to chelate the zinc ion in the catalytic center. The phenyl linker moiety of both compounds forms π - π stacking with Phe144 and Phe 200 in HDAC 3 to fit the hydrophobic tunnel of the active site. Interestingly, the docking indicates that compound **4c** with the amide group instead of a benzylic nitrogen between the 'linker' and the 'lid' doesn't interact in the 'lid' region with the protein surface in contrast to **4a**. The amide linkage is connected to a 10-fold loss in potency for HDAC 3 and not for HDAC 1 and 2, thereby indicating that binding of the phenyl to the lid region is key for HDAC 3 binding in contrast to HDAC 1 and 2.

Based on the idea that flexibility is key for HDAC 3 binding we explored a set of compounds with a flexible linker (Table 2). Because of its clearest preference for binding to HDAC 3, we focused on compound **15c**. This molecule was docked in the active site of HDAC 1 and 3 and superimposed (Figure 2B). Using this docking we compared the position of the amino acids in the respective HDAC active sites. A high degree of overlap in the amino acids of the HDAC 1 and HDAC 3 active sites was observed as well as in the docked conformation of **15c**. The only exception is amino acid Asp93 in HDAC 3 compared with Asp99 in HDAC 1 for which the α -carbon atom as well as the amino acid side chain occupy alternative positions. The carboxylic acid of Asp99 in HDAC 1 is located more towards the outside of active site than Asp93 in HDAC 3. This positional and conformational difference can be attributed to the difference between Glu98 in HDAC 1 and Asp92 in HDAC 3. In the crystal structure, Asp99 in HDAC 1 is hydrogen bonded with three water molecules (Figure 2C), whereas Asp93 in HDAC 3 is only hydrogen bonded to one water molecule (Figure 2D). This could contribute to a higher propensity for hydrogen bonding to Asp92 in HDAC 3 compared to Asp99 in HDAC 1 thus resulting in a high affinity of compound **15c** for HDAC 3 compared to HDAC 1. Thus, the positional difference between Asp99 in HDAC 1 and Asp92 in HDAC 3 provides a structural basis to design inhibitors with selectivity among these HDAC isoenzymes by targeting the region between the 'linker' and the 'lid' region of the inhibitors. This adds to the structural understanding of inhibitor selectivity among HDAC 1, 2 and 3, which is, currently, largely focused on the 'zinc binding group' region [22–25].




Figure 2. Docking HDAC inhibitors in the active sites of HDAC 1 and 3. A) Modelling of **4a** and **4c** in the active site of HDAC 3. **4a** is colored in orange, and **4c** is colored in green. The blue mesh indicates the active site surface of HDAC 3, with a grey-colored zinc atom. B) Alignment of HDAC 1 and 3 structures docked with compound **15c**. HDAC 1 is labeled in green, and HDAC 3 is labeled in blue with a grey colored zinc atom. The distance between Asp99 in HDAC 1, while Asp93 in HDAC 3 and the compound is marked in light blue. C) Water coverage of Asp99 HDAC 1 in compound **15c** modelling. D) Water coverage of Asp93 HDAC 3 in compound **15c** modelling.

2.4 NF- κ B activation

It is known that NF- κ B is an important regulator in cytokine secretion of macrophages [18] [26]. Our previous study has shown that Entinostat restored anti-inflammatory IL-10 expression in LPS/INF γ -treated macrophages, which is connected to increased NF- κ B p65 transcriptional activity, acetylation, nuclear localization, and binding to the IL-10 promoter [8]. Therefore, we aimed to connect HDAC isoenzyme selectivity to effects on NF- κ B transcriptional activity. Inhibitors with different HDAC selectivity profiles were tested for their effect on NF- κ B transcriptional activity using a reporter gene assay with RAW-Blue

cells. LPS/IFN γ -stimulated RAW-Blue cells were treated with compounds at non-toxic concentrations ranging between 1-5 μ M (data on cell viability are shown in the supporting information). The pan-HDAC inhibitor SAHA was used as a reference. As shown in Figure 3, both Entinostat and **10b** upregulated the NF- κ B transcriptional activity, whereas RGFP966 and **15c** did not show obvious effects on reporter gene expression at the concentrations applied. Both Entinostat and compound **10b** have a preference for HDAC 1 inhibition compared to a preference for HDAC 3 for RGFP966 and **15c**. These results indicate that HDAC 1 inhibition, rather than HDAC 3 inhibition, plays an essential role in the NF- κ B transcriptional activation in this model.




Figure 3. Effect of SAHA, Entinostat, RGFP966, **10b** and **15c** on NF- κ B transcriptional activity in LPS/IFN γ -stimulated RAW BLUE cells. Cells were treated with the respective HDAC inhibitors at the indicated concentrations for 20 h and stimulated with LPS/IFN γ for the last 4 h of the experiment. The data shown represent means \pm SD of 3 independent experiments. ***p<0.001 and **p<0.01 compared to vehicle treated cells.

2.5 Gene expression

Subsequently, we investigated the effect of HDAC inhibitors with different selectivity's among HDAC 1, 2 and 3 isoenzymes on pro- and anti-inflammatory gene expression. We employed LPS/IFN γ -stimulated RAW264.7 cells to monitor expression of tumor necrosis factor α (TNF α), interleukin-6 (IL-6) and inducible nitric oxide synthase (iNOS) as pro-

inflammatory genes and expression of IL-10 as anti-inflammatory gene [8]. As observed previously, Entinostat increased the expression of both pro- and anti-inflammatory genes. This effect was also observed using the inhibitor **4b**, which also preferably inhibits HDAC 1 (despite at higher concentrations compared to Entinostat due to a lower inhibitory potency). On the contrary, inhibitors with a preference for HDAC 3 inhibition did not show significant effects on gene expression. These results indicate that small molecule inhibition of HDAC 3 may not be strongly connected with regulation of pro- and anti-inflammatory gene expression in this model. This in contrast to previous findings with siRNA mediated downregulation of HDAC 3 downregulated pro-inflammatory gene expression and upregulated expression of IL-10 [27]. Possibly, the structural role of HDAC 3 is more important than its catalytic activity in regulation of pro- and anti-inflammatory gene expression. On the contrary, this study shows that inhibition of the catalytic activity of HDAC 1 or/and HDAC 2 is associated with expression of both pro-inflammatory and anti-inflammatory genes. This indicates a crucial role for the HDAC 1 and HDAC 2 isoforms in the function of macrophages. The stimulation of pro-inflammatory gene expression by HDAC 1 and/or 2 directed inhibitors indicates a role in activation of the immune system that could be beneficial in immunotherapy.




Figure 4. Effects of Entinostat, RGFP966, **15c** and **10b** on pro- and anti- inflammatory gene expression of A) IL10, B) iNOS, C) IL6 and D) TNF α in RAW264.7 macrophages. Cells were treated with the respective HDAC inhibitors at the indicated concentrations for 20 h and stimulated with LPS/IFN γ for the last 4 h of the experiments. Gene expression was analyzed by RT-qPCR. For vehicle treatment, cells were pre-treated with a proportional dilution of the inhibitor solvent DMSO. Data are shown represent as mean values \pm SD of 2-3 independent experiments. *** $p < 0.001$ compared to vehicle treated cells. * $p < 0.05$ compared to vehicle treated cells.

3 Conclusion

In this study, we set out to evaluate the structure activity relationships for selectivity among the HDACs 1, 2 and 3 by structural variation of the unit between the ‘linker’ and the ‘lid’ region of *o*-aminoanilide type HDAC inhibitors. We found that differences in HDAC 1 and HDAC 3 binding can be explained by a structural difference between HDAC 1 and HDAC 3. The Asp92 residue in HDAC 3 occupies a position that is different from the corresponding Asp99 residue in HDAC 1. The Asp92 in HDAC 3 is positioned closer to the

tunnel towards the catalytic site, which could provide a higher propensity for hydrogen bonding, which would explain the 10-fold differences in potency for HDAC 3 inhibition as observed in this study. Subsequently, we set out to connect class I HDAC inhibitory selectivity to NF- κ B transcriptional activity and pro- and anti-inflammatory gene expression. We found that HDAC 1 and/or HDAC 2 selectivity increased the NF- κ B transcriptional activity, whereas HDAC 3 selectivity provided no effect. The same was observed for both pro- and anti-inflammatory gene expression in which HDAC 1 and/or 2 selectivity upregulated gene expression, whereas HDAC 3 selectivity did not provide significant effects. The lack of effect observed with HDAC 3 selective inhibitors stand in contrast to previous studies employing siRNA downregulation thus indicating a structural role for HDAC 3 in inflammatory signaling and not a catalytic role. Altogether, this study provides a basis to further explore isoenzyme selective class I HDAC inhibitors in applications involving immune regulation such as inflammatory disorders and oncology.

4 Experimental section

4.1 Chemistry

4.1.1 General

The solvents and reagents were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich, Acros chemicals or aber GmbH without further purification. Reactions were monitored by thin layer chromatography (TLC). Merck silica gel 60 F254 plates were used and spots were detected under UV light or after staining with potassium permanganate for the non UV-active compounds. MP Ecochrom silica 32-63, 60Å was used for flash column chromatography. ^1H NMR (500 MHz) and ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz) spectra were recorded with a Bruker Avance 4-channel NMR Spectrometer with TXI probe. Chemical shifts were referenced to the residual proton and carbon signal of the deuterated solvent CDCl_3 : $\delta = 7.26$ ppm (^1H) and 77.05 ppm (^{13}C), $(\text{CD}_3)_2\text{SO}$: $\delta = 2.50$ ppm (^1H) and 39.52 ppm (^{13}C), CD_3OD : $\delta = 3.31$ ppm (^1H) and 49.00 ppm (^{13}C). The following abbreviations were used for spin multiplicity: s = singlet, br. s = broad singlet, d = doublet, t = triplet, q = quartet, p = quintet, dd = double of doublets, ddd = double of doublet of doublets, m = multiplet. Fourier Transform Mass Spectrometry (FTMS) was recorded on an Orbitrap XL Hybrid Ion Trap-Orbitrap Mass Spectrometer to give high-resolution mass spectra (HRMS).

4.1.2 Synthetic procedure 1: Reductive Amination

The respective substituted benzoic acid (4.0 mmol) was dissolved in MeOH (7.0 mL). The solution was heated to 50 °C and aniline (4.0 mmol) was added into the solution. Then a

catalytic amount of acetic acid (10 drops) was added into the mixture. The reaction was stirred at 50 °C for 3 h. The mixture was then cooled to room temperature. Molecular sieves and NaBH₃CN (12 mmol) were added and stirring was continued for 16 h. The reaction was quenched with water (20 mL). The suspension was filtered, and the residue was washed with water (20 mL, 3 times) and dried to obtain the final product.

4.1.3 Synthetic procedure 2: Amidation Reaction

The respective carboxylic acid derivative (2 mmol) was added into a flask with dry CH₂Cl₂ (5 mL) and was put on ice. EDCI (2.4 mmol) and HOBt (0.8 mmol) were then added into the mixture and the reaction was stirred on ice for 15 min. Then Et₃N (2.0 mmol) was added into the mixture, followed the amine (2.0 mmol). Subsequently, the mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight. The reaction mixture was evaporated under reduced pressure. The residue was purified by flash chromatography using Petroleum ether: EtOAc 5:1 (v/v) as eluent, to obtain the final product.

4.1.4 Synthetic procedure 3: Ester hydrolysis

Compound **3c** (3.8 mmol) was dissolved in THF:MeOH (8 mL: 4 mL) and a solution of LiOH (15 mmol) in water (8 mL) was added. The reaction was stirred at room temperature for 4h until the solution became homogeneous. The reaction was acidified to pH 1.0 with an aqueous 1 N HCl solution. The solvents were evaporated under reduced pressure, and the residue was dissolved in the EtOAc:CH₂Cl₂ (15 mL:15 mL) and washed with water (20 mL, 3 times). The organic layers were combined, dried over MgSO₄ and evaporated to afford the final product.

4.1.5 Synthetic procedure 4: Ullmann Reaction using L-proline

A mixture of iodobenzene (5.0 mmol), (S)- or (R)-4-bromo-phenylethylamine (5.0 mmol), K₂CO₃ (10 mmol), CuI (0.50 mmol) and L-proline (1.0 mmol) in DMSO (6 mL) was heated to 60 °C for 20 h. After cooling, the mixture was partitioned between water and EtOAc. The organic layer was separated, and the aqueous layer was extracted with EtOAc (10 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with brine (10 mL, 3 times), dried over MgSO₄, filtered, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residual oil was purified by flash chromatography using Petroleum ether: EtOAc 15:1 (v/v) as eluent, to afford the product.

4.1.6 Synthetic procedure 5: Cyanation Reaction

The phenylbromide (1.5 mmol), ZnCN₂ (3.0 mmol), and Pd[(C₆H₅)₃P]₄ (0.15 mmol) were dissolved in anhydrous dimethylformamide (DMF) (4 mL) under a nitrogen atmosphere. The yellow mixture was heated to 105 °C for 28 h. Subsequently, the mixture was cooled to room

temperature and an aqueous 1 N NaOH solution (10 mL) was added to quench the reaction. The mixture was extracted by CH₂Cl₂ (30 mL, 3 times). The organic layers were combined and washed with brine (30 mL, 3 times) and dried over MgSO₄. Subsequently, the solvent was removed under reduced pressure to afford the crude phenylcyanide product that was purified by flash chromatography (Petroleum ether: EtOAc 15:1(v/v)).

4.1.7 Synthetic procedure 6: Acidic hydrolysis of nitriles

The phenylcyanide (0.40 mmol) was suspended in an aqueous 12 N HCl solution (3 mL) and heated to 100 °C overnight until the solution became homogeneous. The solvent was removed under reduce pressure to give the desired compound.

4.1.8 Synthetic procedure 7: Ullmann Reaction using deanol

A 50 mL round bottom flask was filled with iodobenzene (2.0 mmol), 6-aminocaproic acid (3.0 mmol), CuI (0.20 mmol), K₃PO₄•H₂O (4.0 mmol), deanol (3.0 mL) and H₂O (5.0 mL). The atmosphere was replaced for nitrogen gas before heating to 80 °C for 48 h. After cooling to room temperature, ice (20 g) was added and the pH was adjusted to 4-5 using an aqueous 1 N HCl solution. This solution was extracted with EtOAc (30 mL, 3 times). The organic layer was washed with brine, and the solvent was removed under reduced pressure. The residue was purified by flash chromatography, eluted with petroleum ether: EtOAc 1:1 (v/v), to obtain the desired compound.

4.1.9 Synthetic procedure 8: Boc deprotection

The Boc-protected amine (0.92 mmol) was dissolved in dry CH₂Cl₂ (6 mL). Subsequently, trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) (1.5 mL) was added. The mixture was stirred for 2h at room temperature until the solution became homogeneous. The mixture was extracted with and aqueous 1 N NaOH solution (20 mL). The organic layer was collected and dried over MgSO₄. The solvent was removed under reduced pressure to obtain the final product.

4.1.10 4-((phenylamino)methyl)benzoic acid (3a)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 1. White solid, yield 53%. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 7.89 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 2H), 7.46 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 2H), 7.04-7.01 (m, 2H), 6.59 – 6.49 (m, 3H), 6.33 (br, s, 1H), 4.34 (s, 2H). ¹³C NMR (126 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 167.78, 148.91, 146.11, 130.04, 129.90, 129.76, 129.32, 127.57, 127.52, 116.45, 116.28, 112.81, 112.66, 46.67.

4.1.11 4-(1-(phenylamino)ethyl)benzoic acid (3b)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 1. White solid, yield 45%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, $\text{DMSO-}d_6$) δ 7.86 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 2H), 7.48 (d, J = 8.3 Hz, 2H), 6.98 – 6.94 (m, 2H), 6.45–6.43 (m, 3H), 6.21 (d, J = 6.5 Hz, 1H), 4.52 (m, 1H), 1.41 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, $\text{DMSO-}d_6$) δ 167.26, 151.40, 147.73, 129.54, 129.42, 128.70(2), 128.67(2), 126.05(2), 112.73(2), 51.95, 24.35.

4.1.12 methyl 4-(phenylcarbamoyl)benzoate (2c)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 2. White solid, yield 80%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, $\text{Chloroform-}d$) δ 8.17 – 8.12 (m, 2H), 7.93 (d, J = 8.3 Hz, 3H), 7.65 (d, J = 7.9 Hz, 2H), 7.39 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.18 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 3.96 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, $\text{DMSO-}d_6$) δ 166.15, 165.15, 139.53, 139.36, 132.46, 129.63(2), 129.12(2), 128.55(2), 124.41, 120.95(2), 55.03.

4.1.13 4-(phenylcarbamoyl)benzoic acid (3c)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 1. White solid, yield 54%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, $\text{DMSO-}d_6$) δ 10.35 (s, 1H), 8.01 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.91 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.82 (d, J = 7.9 Hz, 2H), 7.35 (t, J = 7.7 Hz, 2H), 7.10 (t, J = 7.3 Hz, 1H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, $\text{DMSO-}d_6$) δ 168.23, 165.54, 143.20, 139.21, 134.87, 128.77(2), 128.43(2), 126.63(2), 123.39, 120.23(2).

4.1.14 4-((methyl(phenyl)amino)methyl)benzoic acid (3d)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 1. Yellow solid, yield 75%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, $\text{DMSO-}d_6$) δ 12.89 (s, 1H), 7.89 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 7.32 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 7.15 (t, J = 7.9 Hz, 2H), 6.70 (d, J = 8.3 Hz, 2H), 6.62 (t, J = 7.1 Hz, 1H), 4.64 (s, 2H), 3.03 (s, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, $\text{DMSO-}d_6$) δ 167.63, 149.35, 145.12, 130.04(2), 129.93, 129.75(2), 129.48(2), 116.53, 112.41(2), 55.70, 39.16.

4.1.15 N-(2-aminophenyl)-4-((phenylamino)methyl)benzamide (4a)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 2. Pink solid, yield 36%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, $\text{DMSO-}d_6$) δ 10.58 (s, 1H), 8.10 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 2H), 7.61 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 1H), 7.58 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 7.53 (d, J = 7.7 Hz, 1H), 7.43 (t, J = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 7.35 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 7.20 (t, J = 6.8 Hz, 2H), 7.02 – 6.74 (m, 3H), 4.47 (s, 2H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, $\text{DMSO-}d_6$) δ 165.66, 148.87, 144.65, 139.02, 133.42, 129.30(2), 128.29(2), 127.30(2), 127.12, 126.90, 124.13, 117.13, 116.85, 116.33, 112.83(2), 46.57. HRMS: $\text{C}_{20}\text{H}_{20}\text{ON}_3$ mass expected $[\text{M}+\text{H}]^+$ 318.16009, found 318.15988.

4.1.16 N-(2-aminophenyl)-4-(1-(phenylamino)ethyl)benzamide (4b)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 2. Yellow solid, yield 30%. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 7.89 (s, 1H), 7.83 (d, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 7.46 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 2H), 7.28 (s, 1H), 7.12 – 7.05 (m, 3H), 6.82 (t, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 2H), 6.67 (t, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 6.48 (d, *J* = 7.7 Hz, 2H), 4.54 (q, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 3.91 (br. s, 2H), 1.53 (d, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 3H). ¹³C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 171.19, 149.77, 146.89, 140.73, 132.86(2), 129.17(2), 127.82, 127.19, 126.24(2), 125.23(2), 124.56, 119.73, 118.34, 117.61, 113.33, 53.34, 25.05. HRMS: C₂₁H₂₂ON₃, mass expected [M+H]⁺ 332.17574, found 332.17548.

4.1.17 N₁-(2-aminophenyl)-N₄-phenylterephthalamide (4c)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 2. Yellow solid, yield 61%. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 10.40 (s, 1H), 10.27 (s, 1H), 8.13 – 8.08 (m, 5H), 7.79 (d, *J* = 7.7 Hz, 2H), 7.74 – 7.68 (m, 1H), 7.39 – 7.34 (dt, *J* = 10.0, 6.2 Hz, 4H), 7.13 (t, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 1H). ¹³C NMR (126 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 165.21, 160.46, 139.42, 138.11, 137.27, 131.81, 129.13(2), 128.32(2), 128.19, 128.14(2), 127.28, 126.67, 126.23, 126.53, 124.35, 120.96, 120.84. HRMS: C₂₀H₁₈O₂N₃, mass expected [M+H]⁺ 332.13935, found 332.13913.

4.1.18 N-(2-aminophenyl)-4-((methyl(phenyl)amino)methyl)benzamide (4d)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 2. Yellow solid, yield 41%. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 9.59 (s, 1H), 7.92 (d, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 7.32 (d, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 7.17 – 7.13 (m, 3H), 6.98 – 6.94 (m, 1H), 6.79 – 6.75 (m, 1H), 6.72 (d, *J* = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 6.64 – 6.57 (m, 2H), 4.88 (br. s, 2H), 4.64 (s, 2H), 3.05 (s, 3H). ¹³C NMR (126 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 165.58, 149.37, 143.58, 143.35, 133.61, 129.46(2), 128.48, 128.40, 127.10, 127.04(2), 126.92, 123.77, 116.50, 116.43, 112.61, 112.54, 99.98, 55.66, 39.23. HRMS: C₂₁H₂₂ON₃, mass expected [M+H]⁺ 332.17574, found 332.17563.

4.1.19 (R)- or (S)-N-(1-(4-bromophenyl)ethyl)aniline (7a,b)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 4. Yellow solid, yield 32% - 33%. ¹H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 7.50 – 7.34 (m, 2H), 7.26 – 7.23 (m, 2H), 7.11 – 7.07 (m, 2H), 6.67 (t, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 6.48 (d, *J* = 7.9 Hz, 2H), 4.43 (q, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 1H), 1.50 (d, *J* = 6.7 Hz, 3H). ¹³C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 146.74, 144.20, 131.80, 131.73, 129.20, 129.13, 127.69(2), 120.55, 117.68, 113.43(2), 53.25, 24.90.

4.1.20 (R)- or (S)-4-(1-(phenylamino)ethyl)benzonitrile (8a,b)

The product was obtained from (R)- or (S)-N-(1-(4-bromophenyl)ethyl)aniline using synthetic procedure 5. Yellow solid, yield 47% - 57%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 7.64 – 7.59 (m, 2H), 7.51 – 7.47 (m, 2H), 7.13 – 7.07 (m, 2H), 6.70 – 6.67 (m, 1H), 6.46 – 6.42 (m, 2H), 4.51 (q, J = 6.8 Hz, 1H), 4.08 (br. s, 1H), 1.52 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 151.01, 146.55, 132.70(2), 129.26(2), 126.72(2), 118.93, 117.86, 113.35(2), 110.79, 53.46, 24.97.

4.1.21 (R)- or (S)-4-(1-(phenylamino)ethyl)benzoic acid (9a,b)

The product was obtained from (R)- or (S)-4-(1-(phenylamino)ethyl)benzonitrile using synthetic procedure 6. Yellow solid, yield 57% - 97%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, Methanol-*d*₄) δ 8.03 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 7.48 (m, 5H), 7.29 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 4.90 (d, J = 6.2 Hz, 1H), 1.79 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 3H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, Methanol-*d*₄) δ 165.85, 138.96, 132.68, 130.22(2), 128.49, 128.41, 128.30, 127.67, 126.34(2), 121.42(2), 60.78, 16.01.

4.1.22 (R)- or (S)-N-(2-aminophenyl)-4-(1-(phenylamino)ethyl)benzamide (10a,b)

The product was obtained from (R)- or (S)-4-(1-(phenylamino)ethyl)benzoic acid using synthetic procedure 2. Yellow solid, yield 30% - 32%. The (S)-N-(2-aminophenyl)-4-(1-(phenylamino)ethyl)benzamide $[\alpha]^{20}_{\text{D}}$ (c=1, CH₂Cl₂) = -8.6 ; (R)-N-(2-aminophenyl)-4-(1-(phenylamino)ethyl)benzamide $[\alpha]^{20}_{\text{D}}$ (c=1, CH₂Cl₂) = +8.5 .

4.1.23 6-(phenylamino)hexanoic acid (12a)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 7. Yellow solid, yield 16%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 7.19 – 7.16 (m, 2H), 6.71 (t, J = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 6.62 (d, J = 7.8 Hz, 2H), 3.12 (d, J = 7.2 Hz, 2H), 2.38 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 1.72 – 1.62 (m, 5H), 1.50 – 1.43 (m, 2H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 179.16, 148.14, 129.26(2), 117.50 , 112.97(2), 43.88, 33.87, 29.14, 26.59, 24.45.

4.1.24 tert-butyl (2-(5-(phenylamino)pentanamido)phenyl)carbamate (14a)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 2. Yellow solid, yield 46%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 8.02 (br. s, 1H), 7.55 – 7.51 (m, 1H), 7.39 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 1H), 7.33 (q, J = 5.0 Hz, 1H), 7.19 – 7.14 (m, 3H), 6.74 (br. s, 1H), 6.69 (t, J = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 6.59 (d, J = 7.9 Hz, 1H), 6.37 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 1H), 3.15 – 3.08 (m, 2H), 2.42 – 2.39 (m, 2H), 1.82 – 1.71 (m, 2H), 1.69 – 1.63 (m, 2H), 1.52 – 1.48 (m, 11H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 204.06, 171.86, 148.37, 130.36, 129.25(2), 126.18, 125.74, 124.52, 121.59, 117.20(2), 112.72(2), 81.11, 43.72, 37.27, 29.24, 28.30(3), 26.71, 25.45.

4.1.25 tert-butyl (2-(6-oxo-6-phenylhexanamido)phenyl)carbamate(14b)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 2. Yellow solid, yield 66%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 8.30 (br. s, 1H), 7.97 – 7.92 (m, 2H), 7.59 – 7.55 (m, 1H), 7.47 – 7.40 (m, 4H), 7.16 – 7.10 (m, 1H), 7.08 (br. s, 1H), 2.99 (t, J = 7.3 Hz, 2H), 2.38 (t, J = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 1.80 – 1.74 (m, 4H), 1.49 (s, 9H), 1.47 – 1.41 (m, 2H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 200.39, 172.25, 154.22, 136.92, 133.05, 130.79, 130.06, 128.61(2), 128.04(2), 126.14, 125.35, 124.53(2), 80.83, 38.28, 36.95, 28.75, 28.32(3), 25.50, 23.75.

4.1.26 tert-butyl (2-(5-oxo-5-(phenylamino)pentanamido)phenyl)carbamate(14c)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 2. Yellow solid, yield 66%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 8.49 (br. s, 1H), 7.80 – 7.77 (m, 2H), 7.50 – 7.37 (m, 5H), 7.18 – 7.07 (m, 3H), 6.67 (br. s, 1H), 3.46 (q, J = 6.5 Hz, 2H), 2.44 (t, J = 7.1 Hz, 2H), 1.82 – 1.76 (m, 2H), 1.71 – 1.65 (m, 2H), 1.48 (s, 9H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 172.70, 168.22, 154.57, 134.80, 131.87, 131.17, 130.29, 128.95, 127.33(2), 126.57, 125.67, 125.54(2), 124.91, 81.25, 39.59, 36.58, 29.19, 28.68(3), 23.01.

4.1.27 N-(2-aminophenyl)-5-(phenylamino)pentanamide(15a)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 8. Yellow solid, yield 90%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 9.10 (s, 1H), 7.15 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 7.04 (t, J = 7.8 Hz, 2H), 6.88 (t, J = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 6.71 (d, J = 9.0 Hz, 1H), 6.54 – 6.47 (m, 4H), 5.51 (t, J = 5.6 Hz, 1H), 4.81 (s, 2H), 2.98 (q, J = 6.8 Hz, 2H), 2.32 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 1.66 – 1.54 (m, 4H), 1.44 – 1.38 (m, 2H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*) δ 171.55, 148.36, 140.75, 129.27(2), 127.24, 125.17, 124.36, 119.66, 118.35, 117.23, 112.74(2), 43.68, 36.88, 29.22, 26.74, 25.51.

4.1.28 N-(2-aminophenyl)-6-oxo-6-phenylhexanamide(15b)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 8. Yellow solid, yield 96%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 9.09 (s, 1H), 7.97 (d, J = 7.1 Hz, 2H), 7.63 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 7.52 (t, J = 7.7 Hz, 2H), 7.14 (d, J = 9.1 Hz, 1H), 6.88 (t, J = 8.3 Hz, 1H), 6.70 (d, J = 9.2 Hz, 1H), 6.52 (t, J = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 4.81 (br. s, 2H), 3.04 (t, J = 7.2 Hz, 2H), 2.32 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 1.73 – 1.57 (m, 4H), 1.31 – 1.35 (m, 2H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 200.56, 171.56, 142.36, 137.19, 133.50, 129.87, 129.22(2), 128.33(2), 126.14, 125.78, 124.00, 116.27, 38.28, 36.12, 28.77, 25.67, 24.05.

4.1.29 N-(5-((2-aminophenyl)amino)-5-oxopentyl)benzamide(15c)

The product was obtained using synthetic procedure 8. Yellow solid, yield 72%. ^1H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO-*d*₆) δ 9.10 (s, 1H), 8.49 (t, J = 5.3 Hz, 1H), 7.84 (d, J = 7.3 Hz, 2H), 7.51

(t, $J = 7.3$ Hz, 1H), 7.45 (t, $J = 7.4$ Hz, 2H), 7.15 (d, $J = 7.7$ Hz, 1H), 6.88 (t, $J = 7.6$ Hz, 1H), 6.70 (d, $J = 7.9$ Hz, 1H), 6.52 (t, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 1H), 4.83 (s, 2H), 3.29 (q, $J = 6.3$ Hz, 2H), 2.35 (t, $J = 7.2$ Hz, 2H), 1.67 – 1.54 (m, 4H). ^{13}C NMR (126 MHz, DMSO- d_6) δ 171.52, 166.56, 142.35, 135.15, 131.51, 128.70(2), 127.68, 127.54, 125.76, 126.18(2), 123.98, 116.30, 39.52, 35.94, 29.31, 23.37.

4.2 HDAC inhibition study

Black 96-well flat bottom microplates (Corning® Costar®, Corning Incorporated, NY) were used. Human recombinant C-terminal FLAG-tag, C-terminal His-tag HDAC 1 (BPS Bioscience, Catalog #: 50051), human recombinant C-terminal FLAG-tag HDAC 2 (BPS Bioscience, Catalog #: 50052) or human recombinant C-terminal His-tag HDAC 3/NcoR2 (BPS Bioscience, Catalog #: 50003) were diluted in incubation buffer (25 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, 137 mM NaCl, 2.7 mM KCl, 1 mM MgCl, 0.01% Triton-X and 1 mg/mL BSA). 40 μL of this dilution was incubated with 10 μL of different concentrations of inhibitors in 10% DMSO/incubation buffer and 50 μL of the fluorogenic Boc-Lys(ϵ -Ac)-AMC (20 mM, Bachem, Germany) at 37 °C. After 90 min incubation time 50 μL of the stop solution (25 mM Tris-HCl (pH 8), 137 mM NaCl, 2.7 mM KCl, 1 mM MgCl₂, 0.01% Triton-X, 6.0 mg/mL trypsin (porcine pancreas Type IX-S, lyophilized powder, 13,000-20,000 BAEE units/mg protein, Sigma Aldrich) and 200 μM vorinostat) was added. After a following incubation at 37 °C for 30 min, the fluorescence was measured on a Synergy H1 Platerreader (BioTek, USA) with a gain of 70 and an excitation wavelength of 370 nm and an emission wavelength of 460 nm. GraphPad Prism 5.0 (GraphPad Software, Inc.) was used for the determination of the IC₅₀ of each inhibitor. Nonlinear regression was used for data fitting.

4.3 Docking study

Docking studies were performed to get insight in the structure activity relationships. All molecular handlings were done with the program Discovery studio (Dassault systèmes) version 2018 and the crystal structures of human HDAC 1 (PDB-code: 5ICN), human HDAC 2 (PDB-code: 4LY1) and human HDAC 3 (PDB-code: 4A69).

The CDOCKER protocol was used for docking which is a CHARMM based algorithm. Docking was verified by use of the ligand (4-(acetylamino)-N-[2-amino-5-(thiophen-2-yl)phenyl]benzamide) from the crystal structure 4LY1. This ligand contains the zinc-binding group and the linker group also present in our molecules. First, the ligand was removed from 4LY1 and subsequently docked back in the crystal structure. All 10 poses given show a comparable position compared to the original pose from the crystal structure.

Also the ligand was placed in HDAC 1 and HDAC 3 after superimposing HDAC 1 and HDAC 3 with HDAC 2 at the C α carbon atoms of the backbone. The position of the o-aminoanilide core was used as a reference to evaluate the dockings in the HDAC active sites. Docked poses from all the compounds where the NH₂ from the zinc-binding group did not face the zinc in the same fashion as the reference, were discarded. Poses with the lowest CDOCKER energies were chosen.

4.4 Cell viability

4.4.1 Cell culture

RAW264.7 macrophages were obtained from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC; Wesel, Germany) and cultured in 96-well plate or flasks (Costar Europe, Badhoevedrop, The Netherlands) at 37 °C under 5% CO₂/95% air in Dulbecco's Modification of Eagle's Medium (DMEM) containing GlutaMAX™ (Gibco® by life Technologies, Bleiswijk, The Netherlands) supplemented with 10% (v/v) heated fetal bovine serum (FBS; Invitrogen, Breda, The Netherlands), 2 mM additional GlutaMAX™ (Gibco® by life Technology, Bleiswijk, The Netherlands), 100 U/ml penicillin (Gibco® by life Technologies, Bleiswijk, The Netherlands) and 100 µg/ml streptomycin (Gibco® by life Technologies, Bleiswijk, The Netherlands). RAW 264.7 cells were used between passage 5 and 16.

4.4.2 MTS assay

RAW264.7 cells were seeded in 96-well plate at the concentration of 25,000 cells/cm². The next day, medium was replaced with fresh medium containing HDAC inhibitors at the indicated concentrations. After 24 h incubation at 37 °C, 20 µl CellTiter 96 AQueous One Solution reagent (Promega) was added to each well. The cells were incubated at 37 °C for 2 h in dark. The absorbance at 490 nm was measured using an Synergy H1 plate reader. The results were plotted as % of control.

4.5 NF-κB activation

RAW-Blue™ cells (InvivoGen, San Diego, CA, USA) are derived from RAW264.7 macrophages. The secreted embryonic alkaline phosphatase (SEAP) is detected using SEAP detection medium (QUANTI-Blue™). RAW-Blue cells were seeded at a concentration around 550,000 cells/mL. The cells were treated with 10 ng/mL LPS/IFN γ for 4 h, after the pre-incubation with HDAC inhibitors for 16 h. The detection medium (QUANTI-BLUE) was prepared according to the manufacturer's protocol. 20 µl cell supernatant was added into 180 µL detection medium and incubated at 37 °C for 3 h. The SEAP activity was measured using

a Synergy H1 plate reader with absorbance at 650 nm. The results were plotted as % of control. RAW-Blue cells were used between passage 4 to 14.

4.6 RT-qPCR

RAW264.7 cells were washed twice with Dulbecco's Phosphate-buffered Saline (DPBS, Gibco® by life Technologies, Bleiswijk, The Netherlands) and total RNA was isolated by Maxwell® 16 LEV simplyRNA Tissue Kit (Promega) according to the manufacturer's protocol. RNA concentration(OD260) and purity (OD260/OD280) were measured by NanoDrop ND-1000 UV-Vis spectrophotometer (NanoDrop Technologies, Wilmington, DE, USA). Then, RNA was reverse transcribed to cDNA using the Reverse Transcription Kit (#A3500, Promega). 10 ng of cDNA, 5 µL 2x SensiMix SYBR Lo-ROX and 0.4 µL primers were applied for each RT-qPCR, which was performed on a QuantStudio(TM) 7 Flex System. For each sample, the real-time PCR were performed in duplicate. Data analysis was performed with QuantStudio™ Real-Time PCR Software. Gene expression levels were normalized to the expression of the reference gene glyceralde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase (GAPDH), which was not influenced by the experimental conditions resulting in the ΔC_t value. Gene expression levels were calculated by the comparative C_t method ($2^{-\Delta\Delta C_t}$)[28].

Primers for qRT-PCR were as follows:

GAPDH forward, 5'- ACAGTCCATGCCATCACTGC-3';
 GAPDH reverse, 5'- GATCCACGACGGACACATTG-3';
 IL-10 forward, 5'- ATAAGTGCACCCACTTCCCAGTC-3';
 IL-10 reverse, 5'- CCCAAGTAACCCTTAAAGTCCTGC-3';
 IL-6 forward, 5'- TGATGCTGGTGACAACCACGGC-3';
 IL-6 reverse, 5'- TAAGCCTCCGACTTGTGAAGTGGTA-3';
 TNF α forward, 5'- CATCTTCTCAAATTCGAGTGACAA-3';
 TNF α reverse, 5'- GAGTAGACAAGGTACAACCC-3';
 miNOS forward, 5'- CTATCAGGAAGAAATGCAGGAGAT-3';
 miNOS reverse, 5'- GAGCACGCTGAGTACCTCATT-3';

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the Chinese Scholarship Council (CSC) for providing a scholarship to Fangyuan Cao.

Conflicts of Interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Reference

- [1] N.G.J. Leus, M.R.H. Zwinderman, F.J. Dekker, Histone deacetylase 3 (HDAC 3) as emerging drug target in NF- κ B-mediated inflammation, *Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol.* 33 (2016) 160–168. doi:10.1016/j.cbpa.2016.06.019.
- [2] M. Haberland, R.L. Montgomery, E.N. Olson, The many roles of histone deacetylases in development and physiology: Implications for disease and therapy, *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 10 (2009) 32–42. doi:10.1038/nrg2485.
- [3] H.-T. Qin, H.-Q. Li, F. Liu, Selective histone deacetylase small molecule inhibitors: recent progress and perspectives, *Expert Opin. Ther. Pat.* 27 (2016) 1–15. doi:10.1080/13543776.2017.1276565.
- [4] E. Seto, M. Yoshida, Erasers of histone acetylation: The histone deacetylase enzymes, *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* 6 (2014). doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a018713.
- [5] M. Dokmanovic, C. Clarke, P.A. Marks, Histone Deacetylase Inhibitors: Overview and Perspectives, *Mol. Cancer Res.* 5 (2007) 981–989. doi:10.1158/1541-7786.MCR-07-0324.
- [6] E.E. Hull, M.R. Montgomery, K.J. Leyva, HDAC Inhibitors as Epigenetic Regulators of the Immune System : Impacts on Cancer Therapy and Inflammatory Diseases, 2016 (2016). doi:10.1155/2016/8797206.
- [7] A.G. Kazantsev, L.M. Thompson, Therapeutic application of histone deacetylase inhibitors for central nervous system disorders, *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* 7 (2008) 854–868. doi:10.1038/nrd2681.
- [8] N.G.J. Leus, T. van den Bosch, P.E. van der Wouden, K. Krist, M.E. Ourailidou, N. Eleftheriadis, L.E.M. Kistemaker, S. Bos, R.A.F. Gjaltema, S.A. Mekonnen, R. Bischoff, R. Gosens, H.J. Haisma, F.J. Dekker, HDAC1-3 inhibitor MS-275 enhances IL10 expression in RAW264.7 macrophages and reduces cigarette smoke-induced airway inflammation in mice, *Sci. Rep.* 7 (2017) 45047. doi:10.1038/srep45047.
- [9] A. Villagra, E.M. Sotomayor, E. Seto, Histone deacetylases and the immunological network: Implications in cancer and inflammation, *Oncogene.* 29 (2010) 157–173. doi:10.1038/onc.2009.334.
- [10] R. Glauben, E. Sonnenberg, M. Zeitz, B. Siegmund, HDAC inhibitors in models of inflammation-related tumorigenesis, *Cancer Lett.* 280 (2009) 154–159. doi:10.1016/j.canlet.2008.11.019.
- [11] M.R. Shakespear, M.A. Halili, K.M. Irvine, D.P. Fairlie, M.J. Sweet, Histone deacetylases as

- regulators of inflammation and immunity, *Trends Immunol.* 32 (2011) 335–343. doi:10.1016/j.it.2011.04.001.
- [12] M. Conte, R. De Palma, L. Altucci, HDAC inhibitors as epigenetic regulators for cancer immunotherapy, *Int. J. Biochem. Cell Biol.* 98 (2018) 65–74. doi:10.1016/j.biocel.2018.03.004.
- [13] S. Aspeslagh, D. Morel, J.C. Soria, S. Postel-Vinay, Epigenetic modifiers as new immunomodulatory therapies in solid tumours, *Ann. Oncol.* 29 (2018) 8HDAC1-3 inhibitors provided significantly increas. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdy050.
- [14] M.D. Cantley, D.R. Haynes, Epigenetic regulation of inflammation: Progressing from broad acting histone deacetylase (HDAC) inhibitors to targeting specific HDACs, *Inflammopharmacology.* 21 (2013) 301–307. doi:10.1007/s10787-012-0166-0.
- [15] A. Shapouri-Moghaddam, S. Mohammadian, H. Vazini, M. Taghadosi, S.A. Esmaili, F. Mardani, B. Seifi, A. Mohammadi, J.T. Afshari, A. Sahebkar, Macrophage plasticity, polarization, and function in health and disease, *J. Cell. Physiol.* 233 (2018) 6425–6440. doi:10.1002/jcp.26429.
- [16] F.J. Dekker, T. Van Den Bosch, N.I. Martin, Small molecule inhibitors of histone acetyltransferases and deacetylases are potential drugs for inflammatory diseases, *Drug Discov. Today.* 19 (2014) 654–660. doi:10.1016/j.drudis.2013.11.012.
- [17] Z. Lu, R.J. Twieg, Copper-catalyzed aryl amination in aqueous media with 2-dimethylaminoethanol ligand, *Tetrahedron Lett.* 46 (2005) 2997–3001. doi:10.1016/j.tetlet.2005.03.027.
- [18] M.E. Ourailidou, N.G.J. Leus, K. Krist, A. Lenoci, A. Mai, F.J. Dekker, Chemical epigenetics to assess the role of HDAC1-3 inhibition in macrophage pro-inflammatory gene expression, *Medchemcomm.* 7 (2016). doi:10.1039/c6md00375c.
- [19] N. Khan, M. Jeffers, S. Kumar, C. Hackett, F. Boldog, N. Khramtsov, X. Qian, E. Mills, S.C. Berghs, N. Carey, P.W. Finn, L.S. Collins, A. Tumber, J.W. Ritchie, P.B. Jensen, H.S. Lichenstein, M. Sehested, Determination of the class and isoform selectivity of small-molecule histone deacetylase inhibitors, *Biochem. J.* 409 (2008) 581–589. doi:10.1042/BJ20070779.
- [20] C.J. Chou, D. Herman, J.M. Gottesfeld, Pimelic diphenylamide 106 is a slow, tight-binding inhibitor of class I histone deacetylases, *J. Biol. Chem.* 283 (2008) 35402–35409. doi:10.1074/jbc.M807045200.
- [21] B.E.L. Lauffer, R. Mintzer, R. Fong, S. Mukund, C. Tam, I. Zilberleyb, B. Flicke, A. Ritscher, G. Fedorowicz, R. Vallero, D.F. Ortwine, J. Gunzner, Z. Modrusan, L. Neumann, C.M. Koth, J.S. Kaminker, C.E. Heise, P. Steiner, Histone deacetylase (HDAC) inhibitor kinetic rate constants

- correlate with cellular histone acetylation but not transcription and cell viability, *J. Biol. Chem.* 288 (2013) 26926–26943. doi:10.1074/jbc.M113.490706.
- [22] F.F. Wagner, M. Lundh, T. Kaya, P. McCarren, Y.L. Zhang, S. Chattopadhyay, J.P. Gale, T. Galbo, S.L. Fisher, B.C. Meier, A. Vetere, S. Richardson, N.G. Morgan, D.P. Christensen, T.J. Gilbert, J.M. Hooker, M. Leroy, D. Walpita, T. Mandrup-Poulsen, B.K. Wagner, E.B. Holson, An Isochemogenic Set of Inhibitors to Define the Therapeutic Potential of Histone Deacetylases in β -Cell Protection, *ACS Chem. Biol.* 11 (2016) 363–374. doi:10.1021/acscchembio.5b00640.
- [23] J.C. Bressi, A.J. Jennings, R. Skene, Y. Wu, R. Melkus, R. De Jong, S. O'Connell, C.E. Grimshaw, M. Navre, A.R. Gangloff, Exploration of the HDAC2 foot pocket: Synthesis and SAR of substituted N-(2-aminophenyl)benzamides, *Bioorganic Med. Chem. Lett.* 20 (2010) 3142–3145. doi:10.1016/j.bmcl.2010.03.091.
- [24] J.L. Methot, P.K. Chakravarty, M. Chenard, J. Close, J.C. Cruz, W.K. Dahlberg, J. Fleming, C.L. Hamblett, J.E. Hamill, P. Harrington, A. Harsch, R. Heidebrecht, B. Hughes, J. Jung, C.M. Kenific, A.M. Kral, P.T. Meinke, R.E. Middleton, N. Ozerova, D.L. Sloman, M.G. Stanton, A.A. Szewczak, S. Tyagarajan, D.J. Witter, J. Paul Secrist, T.A. Miller, Exploration of the internal cavity of histone deacetylase (HDAC) with selective HDAC1/HDAC2 inhibitors (SHI-1:2), *Bioorganic Med. Chem. Lett.* 18 (2008) 973–978. doi:10.1016/j.bmcl.2007.12.031.
- [25] D.J. Witter, P. Harrington, K.J. Wilson, M. Chenard, J.C. Fleming, B. Haines, A.M. Kral, J.P. Secrist, T.A. Miller, Optimization of biaryl Selective HDAC1&2 Inhibitors (SHI-1:2), *Bioorganic Med. Chem. Lett.* 18 (2008) 726–731. doi:10.1016/j.bmcl.2007.11.047.
- [26] X. Chen, I. Barozzi, A. Termanini, E. Prosperini, A. Recchiuti, J. Dalli, F. Mietton, G. Matteoli, S. Hiebert, G. Natoli, Requirement for the histone deacetylase Hdac3 for the inflammatory gene expression program in macrophages, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 109 (2012) E2865–E2874. doi:10.1073/pnas.1121131109.
- [27] N.G.J. Leus, P.E. Van Der Wouden, T. Van Den Bosch, W.T.R. Hooghiemstra, M.E. Ourailidou, L.E.M. Kistemaker, R. Bischoff, R. Gosens, H.J. Haisma, F.J. Dekker, HDAC 3-selective inhibitor RGFP966 demonstrates anti-inflammatory properties in RAW 264.7 macrophages and mouse precision-cut lung slices by attenuating NF- κ B p65 transcriptional activity, *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 108 (2016) 58–74. doi:10.1016/j.bcp.2016.03.010.
- [28] K.J. Livak, T.D. Schmittgen, Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time quantitative PCR and the $2^{-\Delta\Delta CT}$ method, *Methods.* 25 (2001) 402–408. doi:10.1006/meth.2001.1262.

- Selectivity among HDAC 1, 2 and 3 was correlated to inflammation.
- A positional difference in a conserved amino acid explains inhibitory selectivity among HDAC 1 and 3.
- HDAC 1 and/or HDAC 2 selectivity increased the NF- κ B activity, and pro-inflammatory gene transcription.
- Small molecule HDAC 3 inhibition had not effect in NF- κ B activity and pro-inflammatory gene transcription.